

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 24-28, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, specifically at pages 18-19.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-10, 12-22, and 24-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,263,352 to Cohen (hereinafter, merely “Cohen”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0023111 to Arora et al. (hereinafter, merely “Arora”).

Claims 11 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Cohen in view of Arora and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,638 to Burge et al. (hereinafter, merely “Burge”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...defining content, layout, structure, and appearance of the web site independently;”

inserting a placeholder on more than one page of the web site, the placeholder representing same information...” (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Cohen, Arora, and Burge, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, the art used as a basis of rejection does not teach or suggest defining content, layout, structure, and appearance of the web site independently, and inserting a placeholder on more than one page of the web site, the placeholder representing same information, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 12, 13, and 24-28 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope and are therefore patentable for similar reasons.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800